Mr. Ben Bradlee, Editor
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

2/19/77

Dear King Canute,

This is not a personal complaint about your commanding of the waves through Goshko in this morning's Post. I'm grateful that he did not give me a conflict of interest. If he had conformed him to the journalistic norm - perhaps I should say what was once the journalistic norm - of consulting another and opposing source I'd probably have given him some of the results of my more recent investigations of the King assassination. As it is I'll complete my work my way.

However, by any concept the OPR report released yesterday is a partisan job about which the new Attorney General himself expressed grave doubts. These were published by a service to which the Post subscribes - but not by the Post. This is represented as the result of a long investigation, but of what? And by whom? The answers are well known to Post reporters, but your national desk saw fit to assign other than its experts on this subject to the story. Instead it assigned the reporter who depends on sources inside the Department of Justice, which here was investigating itself. Putting Goshko in this position, I believe, was grossly unfair to him. You made him and the Post an adjunct of government, for all practical purposes. It was even more unfair to assign a single reporter to a story of this significance because the mere reading of the report was too much for a simgle reporter.

There has been another investigation. I have conducted it from the time Dr. King was killed. Part of it is embodied in a book the Post saw fit not to review or ever mention, despite its unique history of opening the case once. This is the only book not in accord with the official account of that crime. On this basis alone I am a quotable source. The continuing investigation, known to the Post, is still another basis.

In all of Goshko's story there is bit one fact I did not publish long ago in this book that in common with all you, personally, ordered not to be reviewed. It is the name Manuel. I offered it all to the Post in 1969, when you found it unworthy.

The reason for the withdrawal of Officer Redditt I did not publish. But neither did the Post when it was provided by a syndicate to which you subscribe. That he was withdrawn, that the firemen were, I did publish, with an explanation of the reason: Dr. King was being spied upon, not protected. His sympathizers in the police and fire squads were removed to avoid scandal.

That this is the fourth official internal investigation is not known to your readers. That officialdom required a fourth would seem to be commentary on the three prior ones, would it not? It reaches the same conclusions, of course and you suppress leaving the Attorney General dissatisfied.

Different official explanation will be provided if you inquire of officials but if you check the records on timing you will find that each of these four coincides with what I was doing in this case,

Going down the middle on a subject made more controversial by the adbications of all the major elements of the press is not easy. Neither is living with the debasing of our fine journalistic traditions by the press itself. However, I will be defending the Post against unfair attacks this coming week.

As a younger Solzhenitsyn said, "As little truth as there is in the world the supply still exceeds the demand." Alas in particular in what was once a fine newspaper.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg